

AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

Please replace the paragraph at page 3, line 31, with the following rewritten paragraph:

One difficulty is to determine the number of UP packets to be sent for an update. If too many are sent, the context would already be updated and valid, while ~~still~~ UP packets are still sent. This unnecessarily increases the transmitted bits and decreases the efficiency, because the UP packets are larger than NUP packets. On the other hand if not enough UP packets are sent the risk of losing the context is increased, because the probability increases that none of the sent UP packets is received.

Please replace the paragraph at page 7, line 10, with the following rewritten paragraph:

Referring now to FIG. 3, the sequence of UP and NUP packets during the context update phase can be divided into a number of subsequences. Each subsequence contains ~~of~~ a number of UP packets followed by a number of NUP packets. The following parameters are used for describing the UP-NUP sequence according to the invention.

Please replace the paragraph at page 10, line 9, with the following rewritten paragraph:

This is because some media codecs (e.g. voice codecs) can cope with some packet loss. For instance, if the codec is capable of compensating for a packet loss of up to x packets so that the user cannot hear the packet loss, the constant parameter k is set lower than this number x. For this purpose, the compressor may for instance read the payload-type field of the RTP header to detect the used codec, if possible. Alternatively, the compressor uses any available out-of-band ~~signalling~~ signaling.